

Remarks/Arguments

In the Non-Final Office Action dated August 18, 2010, it is noted that claims 1, 4-9, and 12-16 are pending in this application; and that claims 1, 4-9, and 12-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103.

By this response, claims 1 and 9 have been amended to include limitations concerning the guest credential; claim 4 has been cancelled without prejudice and its limitations have been included in each of independent claims 1 and 9; and claim 9 has been amended to include the “receiving” limitation for the access point as found in original claim 1. The former limitations in amended claim 1 are supported by the original specification at page 4, lines 7-12, for example. The latter limitations are supported by the original claims. No new matter has been added.

Cited Art

The following references have been cited and applied in the present Office Action: U.S. Patent 7,177,637 to Liu et al. (hereinafter referenced as “*Liu*”); U.S. Patent 6,792,474 to Hopprich et al. (hereinafter referenced as “*Hopprich*”); and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0157090 to Anton, Jr. (hereinafter referenced as “*Anton*”).

Rejection of Claims 1, 4-9, and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 4-9, and 12-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Liu in view of Hopprich. Claims 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Liu in view of Hopprich and Anton. Claim 4 has been cancelled without prejudice. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

None of the references teach, show, or suggest sending guest credentials or receiving guest credentials included in the request for access, as defined in independent claims 1 and 9.

Authentication of the guest user is not taught, shown, or suggested by either Liu or Hopprich. In all the cited sections of Liu, it is seen that Liu merely registers a guest user. *See Liu particularly at col. 3, lines 42-44.* Registration does not involve authentication, in general, and certainly not as taught by Liu. Hopprich merely appears to disclose a number of techniques to determine whether a user is a local user or a guest user or even an untrusted user. The

determination of user process is a separate process from the authentication process as defined in the claims.

Anton does not appear to cure the defects in the teachings of Liu and Hopprich as identified above with respect to the independent claims. Thus, the combination of Liu, Hopprich, and Anton fail to teach, show, or suggest all the limitations of the independent claims and the claims dependent thereon.

In light of these remarks, it is submitted that the limitations of independent claims 1 and 9 and the claims dependent thereon would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art upon a reading of Liu, Hopprich, and Anton, whether taken separately or in combination. Thus, it is believed that claims 1, 5-9, and 12-16 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Entry of this amendment, reconsideration of this application, and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Junbiao Zhang et al.

November 15, 2010

/Wan Yee Cheung/
Wan Yee Cheung
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,410

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08540